

REMARKS

Claim 27 is pending in the above-identified application. Claims 1-26 were previously cancelled. (Sec, July 25, 2003 Preliminary Amendment).

In the Office Action of July 21, 2008, claim 27 was rejected.

With this Amendment, claim 27 is amended. No new matter was added.

I. 35 U.S.C. § 103 Obviousness Rejection of Claims

Claim 27 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being as being unpatentable over *Nishizawa* (U.S. Pat. No. 5,122,881)(“*Nishizawa*”). Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

In relevant part, independent claim 27 recites:

“a common power supply connection which is connected to both a drain of said reset element and a drain of said amplifying element.”

This is clearly unlike *Nishizawa*, which fails to disclose a common power supply connection which is commonly connected to both the drains of the reset element and the amplifying element. Instead, *Nishizawa* discloses connecting the drain of an amplifying circuit to a voltage VD1 and the drain of a reset circuit to a voltage PDRV from separate power supply units. See, U.S. Pat. No. 5,122,881, Col. 5, l. 31 - Col. 6, l. 30. Since the voltage to the drain of the reset unit and the voltage to the drain of the amplifying circuit are from different power supplies, *Nishizawa* fails to disclose a required element of the claim.

As the Applicant’s specification discloses, by providing a common power supply connection which connects to both the drains of the reset element and the amplifying element, the relevant photoelectric conversion element can be (and in practice is) completely reset every

time a pixel is output thereby suppressing fixed pattern noise and preventing the generation of residual images. See, U.S. Pat. Pub. No. 2005/0088548, Para. [0087].

Further, there is nothing in *Nishizawa* to suggest modifying the *Nishizawa* configuration to commonly connect the drains of the reset element and the amplifying element of a pixel unit to the same power supply signal.

Therefore, because *Nishizawa* fails to disclose or even fairly suggest all of the features of the claim 27, the rejection cannot stand.

II. Conclusion

In view of the above amendments and remarks, Applicant submits that all claims are clearly allowable over the cited prior art, and respectfully requests early and favorable notification to that effect.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: October 20, 2008

By: /David R. Metzger/
David R. Metzger
Registration No. 32,919
SONNENSCHN NATH & ROSENTHAL LLP
P.O. Box 061080
Wacker Drive Station, Sears Tower
Chicago, Illinois 60606-1080
(312) 876-8000

12324263/V-1